

PATENT  
450117-03308**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 41-77 are pending. Claim 77 is hereby added. Claims 41, 59 and 77 are independent. Claims 41 and 59 are hereby amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amended recitations in the claims is found throughout the specification and from the canceled claims.

Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 41-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,122 to Arunachalam. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 41 recites, *inter alia*:

"A wireless mobile device ...comprising...

a processing system with a component coordinator

PATENT  
450117-03308

wherein the wireless mobile device is a resource constrained wireless mobile unit having no additional support from the network. (emphases added)

The Office Action maintained the rejection of the prior Office Action. In particular, the Office Action suggests that the quality-of-service (QoS) manager (205) and the QoS agent (301) disclosed in Arunachalam correspond to the component coordinator (10) and the QoS broker (8), respectively, in the present application. Applicant submits that the QoS manager (205) of Arunachalam is part of a stationary network computer. *See, for example*, col. 4, lines 1-4; col. 4, lines 34-45 and FIGS. 2 and 3.

In contrast, claim 41 is amended to clarify that the apparatus is directed to a wireless mobile device having a processing system with the component coordinator part of the wireless mobile device. Claim 41 recites, "A wireless mobile device ...comprising...a processing system with a component coordinator . . . wherein the wireless mobile device is a resource constrained wireless mobile unit having no additional support from the network." Thus, the present application is distinguishable from Arunachalam at least for the reason that the component coordinator is part of a wireless mobile device not a stationary device.

The general concept of the invention is a generic framework for a wireless mobile device for supporting applications installed on the mobile device whenever Quality of Service communications with other devices in the communication network are required. The present invention focuses on functions, which are integrated in the mobile device in order to guarantee Quality of Service for local resources, that is, resources of the mobile device, and remote resources, that is, resources of the network. In order to achieve these

PATENT  
450117-03308

functionalities, a component coordinator unit and a Quality of Service broker unit as defined and claimed in amended independent claims 41 and 59 are presented.

Applicant submits claim 41 is not anticipated by Arunachalam because that reference does not disclose each and every limitation of the claim. Specifically, Applicant submits that there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of, "A wireless mobile device ...comprising...a processing system with a component coordinator . . .wherein the wireless mobile device is a resource constrained wireless mobile unit having no additional support from the network," as recited in claim 41.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 41, amended independent claims 59 and 77 are also believed to be patentable.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 41-77 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited

PATENT  
450117-03308


reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:   
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800